

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.111
U.S. Appl. No. 09/777,681

REMARKS

As an initial matter, the undersigned gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the interview of August 2, 2005. Applicant concurs that the Summary of Interview set forth by the Examiner on August 2, 2005 accurately reflects that discussion.

This Amendment is filed in reply to the Office Action dated April 14, 2005 and further to the interview of August 2, 2005. This Amendment is believed to address each point of rejection raised in the Office Action. Therefore, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 20-22 remain pending in the application and remain rejected over the art previously of record. In particular, claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11 and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lazarev in view of Wilder. Claims 6-7, 9 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lazarev in view of Wilder and further in view of Talmi. Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

The Examiner maintains the prior rationale for rejecting the claims and also reiterates some points of rebuttal. Applicant responds as follows.

Independent claim 1 describes an imaging device having image forming and non-image forming areas. It had been previously argued that in Lazarev, all areas of the pick up device comprise imaging areas since it could not be determined *a priori*, which areas comprised non-image areas. The Examiner contends that the disclosure in Lazarev of "[l]enses 70 and 78 may be variable focus or zoom type lenses to accommodate endoscopes having field stops of various sizes," (Col. 6, lines 63-65) implies that fixed field stops can be used. Based on this possibility, the Examiner contends that non-imaging areas in Lazarev would be *a priori* known. Applicant submits that the